

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 15-3313 PA (ASx) Date May 4, 2015

Title Beverly Ann Sesson v. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc.

Present: The PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
HonorableStephen Montes Kerr Not Reported N/A  
Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Tape No.Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants:  
None None**Proceedings:** IN CHAMBERS - COURT ORDER

Before the Court is a Notice of Removal filed by defendant Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. (“Defendant”) on May 1, 2015. In its Notice of Removal, Defendant asserts that this Court has jurisdiction over the action brought against it by plaintiff Beverly Ann Sesson (“Plaintiff”) based on the Court’s diversity jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, having subject matter jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and Congress. See, e.g., Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375, 377, 114 S. Ct. 1673, 1675, 128 L. Ed. 2d 391 (1994). A suit filed in state court may be removed to federal court if the federal court would have had original jurisdiction over the suit. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). A removed action must be remanded to state court if the federal court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). “The burden of establishing federal jurisdiction is on the party seeking removal, and the removal statute is strictly construed against removal jurisdiction.” Prize Frize, Inc. v. Matrix (U.S.) Inc., 167 F.3d 1261, 1265 (9th Cir. 1999). “Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance.” Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992).

In attempting to invoke this Court’s diversity jurisdiction, Defendant must prove that there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. To establish citizenship for diversity purposes, a natural person must be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled in a particular state. Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd., 704 F.2d 1088, 1090 (9th Cir. 1983). Persons are domiciled in the places they reside with the intent to remain or to which they intend to return. See Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). “A person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state.” Id. For the purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a national bank is “a citizen of the State in which its main office, as set forth in its articles of association, is located.” Wachovia Bank v. Schmidt, 546 U.S. 303, 307, 126 S. Ct. 941, 945, 163 L. Ed. 2d 797 (2006) (construing 28 U.S.C. § 1348). For the purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a corporation is a citizen of

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 15-3313 PA (ASx)	Date	May 4, 2015
Title	Beverly Ann Sesson v. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc.		

any state where it is incorporated and of the state where it has its principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c); see also Indus. Tectonics, Inc. v. Aero Alloy, 912 F.2d 1090, 1092 (9th Cir. 1990).

The Notice of Removal alleges that “Based on SPS’s information and belief, as supported by allegations in the Complaint, Plaintiff is, and all times relevant to this proceeding was, a citizen of and domiciled in the State of California. This is evidenced by the fact that Plaintiff alleges that she is an individual residing in the county of Los Angeles, and claims to own the real property located . . . [in] Long Beach, California . . . . (See Compl., ¶ 2, 3). Through the Complaint, Plaintiff seeks to maintain her interest in the Property, thereby evidencing her intent to remain domiciled in the State of California.” (Notice of Removal 3:3-10.) As the Notice of Removal indicates, the Complaint, alleges only Plaintiff’s residence. Because the only support for Defendant’s allegation of Plaintiff’s citizenship is an allegation of residence, and residence is not the same as citizenship, the Notice of Removal’s allegations are insufficient to establish Plaintiff’s citizenship. Nor is Defendant’s assertion of Plaintiff’s citizenship, alleged on “information and belief,” sufficient to meet Defendant’s burden to establish Plaintiff’s citizenship. “Absent unusual circumstances, a party seeking to invoke diversity jurisdiction should be able to allege affirmatively the actual citizenship of the relevant parties.” Kanter, 265 F.3d at 857; Bradford v. Mitchell Bros. Truck Lines, 217 F. Supp. 525, 527 (N.D. Cal. 1963) (“A petition [for removal] alleging diversity of citizenship upon information and belief is insufficient.”). As a result, Defendant’s allegations are insufficient to invoke this Court’s diversity jurisdiction.

Therefore, Defendant has failed to meet its burden to demonstrate the Court’s diversity jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Court remands this action to Los Angeles County Superior Court, Long Beach Courthouse, Case No. NC059981. See 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.